

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed February 21, 2008 the Examiner noted that claims 1-10 were pending, and rejected all claims. Claims 2, 3 and 6-10 have been amended, claims 11-14 have been previously canceled, claim 15 has been added and, thus, in view of the forgoing, claims 1-10 and 15 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. section 101 as non-statutory. Claims 6 and 8 have been amended in consideration of the Examiner's comments and it is submitted they satisfy the requirements of the statute. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. section 112 paragraph 2 as indefinite. The claims have been amended in consideration of the Examiner's comments and it is submitted they satisfy the requirements of the statute. If additional concerns with the claims arise, the Examiner is invited to telephone to resolve the same. Suggestions by the Examiner are also welcome. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as completely anticipated by Dorenbosch.

First, Dorenbosch discusses a system in which voice messages that pass through a conventional telephone line and public switched telephone network (PSTN) are stored.

The controller 112 receives messages from callers utilizing a conventional telephone 124 for communicating with a conventional PSTN (public switch telephone network) 110. The PSTN 110 relays messages to the controller 112 through a conventional telephone line 101 coupled to the controller 112. Upon receiving messages from the PSTN 110, the controller 112 processes the messages, and delivers them to the base stations 116 for transmission to designated SCU's 122.

(See Dorenbosch col. 2, lines 6-14)

The processor 310 is used for controlling operation of the SCU 122. Generally, its primary function is to decode and process demodulated messages provided by the receiver 304, storing them and alerting a user of the received message.

(See Dorenbosch col. 2, lines 39-42).

In contrast, the present invention of claim 1 is about email messages ("An electronic mail receiving method"). Email and voice messages are two completely different things. Claim 6 and 8 also emphasize a similar feature. Withdrawal of the rejection for this reason is requested.

Second, the Examiner asserts that Dorenbosch teaches the feature of "making to a user

a notification that protection must be released ... of an existing electronic mail" found in claim 1. The Examiner particularly points to Dorenbosch at col. 6, lines 1-6. This text of Dorenbosch particularly states:

If in step 510 it is determined that there is insufficient memory space, the SCU 122 proceeds to step 516 where it alerts the user of the SCU 122, by way of the alerting device 322, seeking the user's assistance to purge stored messages in order to further free up memory space. The user is given a predetermined time to purge stored messages. This step provides the reason for the controller 112 delaying transmission of the message fragments in steps 408 and 410. It will be appreciated that, alternatively, the SCU 122 can skip step 516, and instead be programmed to ignore the reception of messages when steps 504 and 506 fail to provide adequate memory space for storage. In this embodiment, programming steps 408 and 410 of the controller 112 would not be necessary.

(See Dorenbosch col. 6, lines 1-14)

As can be seen from the above text, Dorenbosch calls for purging stored messages. Purging means to get rid of or delete (see *purge* - c (2): to get rid of <the leaders had been *purged*> - Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary copyright © 2005 by Merriam-Webster, Incorporated)

In contrast, claims 1, 6 and 8 call for notifications about releasing protection of a message not deleting. Releasing protection of an email message and purging an email message are very different. Withdrawal of the rejection for this additional reason is requested.

It is submitted that the present claims 1, 6 and 8 patentably distinguish over Dorenbosch and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, claim 9 calls "transferring display contents to a protection release operation screen after making the notification to the user". This operation helps facilitate the actual release of protection of a message. This operation is not taught or suggested by the prior art of Dorenbosch. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

New claim 15 also emphasizes the provisions of a message about releasing a protection status. Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests such. It is submitted that this new claim, which is different and not narrower than prior filed claims, distinguishes over the prior art.

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101 and 112. It is also submitted that claims 2, 4, 7 and 10 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a

condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: May 21, 2008

By: /J. Randall Beckers/
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501